Approved For Release 2001 : OFERURE	301500B00010004003	1-6 file
CONTROL NO	TCS-38638-74	

REFERRED TO	RECEIVED		RELEASED		SEEN BY		
OFFICE	SIGNATURE	DATE	TIME	DATE	TIME	NAME & OFFICE SYMBOL	DATE
							-
7E 62	U						
					 		
	25X1A						
							1
					1		

Handle Via Indicated Controls TALENT-KEYHOLE-COMINT

WARNING

This document contains information affecting the national security of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws U. S. Code Title 18, Sections 793, 794 and 798. The law prohibits its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person, as well as its use in any manner prejudicial to the safety or interest of the United States or for the benefit of any foreign government to the detriment of the United States. It is to be seen only by personnel especially indoctrinated and authorized to receive information in the designated control channels. Its security must be maintained in accordance with regulations pertaining to the TALENT-KEYHOLE and Communications Intelligence Controls. No action is to be taken on any communications intelligence which may be contained herein, regardless of the advantage to be gained, if such action might have the effect of revealing the existence and nature of the source, unless such action is first approved by the appropriate authority.

State & NRO declassification & release instructions on file

Approved For Release 2001/03/04: CIA-RDP80B01500R000100040031-6

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington, D.C. 20520

SECRET MEMORANDUM

HANDLE VIA TALENT-KEYHOLE-COMINT CONTROL SYSTEMS JOINTLY

August 6, 1974

25X1A9a

TO

: NIO -

FROM

INR/PMT - Bob Baraz

SUBJECT: MBFR Verification Study -- Draft of Search Problem

I thought it might be useful to write down some comments on the draft you forwarded on July 16. Basically, my comments boil down to a plea for a somewhat less ambitious paper.

Search Capability vs Net Evaluation

My main problem with the paper is that it drafts into an attempt to lay out a net evaluation of capabilities against hypothetical violations of theoretical provisions of an agreement. I would like to see a somewhat narrower focus on search capability as such in this round. By narrowing the focus to a discussion of search capabilities, I think we can produce a rigorous paper which will stand up to scrutiny by our various readers. If we try to do too much in this round, we shall find ourselves in quarrels all over town as to what agreements were postulated and why.

Examples of the Problems

The first five pages of the draft are open to a number of objections on the ground that they are out of tune with what is actually being negotiated:

- -- it is doubtful that an agreement will limit size, type and number of units. The only unit addressed in the Western proposal is a Soviet tank army. (para 32)
- -- it is not clear just what equipment would be limited but the paper suggests (para 4) much more extensive limits on equipment than are actually being considered.

TCS-38638-74 Copy / of 2

SECRET

*Approved For Release 2001/03/04: CIA-RDP80B01500R000100040031-6 HANDLE VIA TALENT-KEYHOLE-COMINT CONTROL SYSTEMS JOINTLY

- 2 -

-- reorganization of service units (para 4 e) is not likely to be forbidden; an American option to do just that is likely to be jealously guarded.

The 30 day figure (para 72) would be acceptable as a convenient break for a coverage study. It is not acceptable as a violation detection specification against all scenarios.

It is doubtful that an agreement would make the kind of specific provisions about Hungary and the three Western MDs specified in para 7c.

A Simple Fix 25X1D

I think that the problems could be fixed with a single swift blow with a pair of scissors. Cut off the introduction and start the paper at para 8. This will require some assumptions

about what is useful coverage, but would avoid getting wrapped up in the intricacies of agreements formulation and violation management in this first examination of collection resources.

25X1D

SECRET

TCS-38638-74